COURT NO. 2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHLA A T NAINITAL

WRIT PETITON NO. 7096 OF 2001 (S/S)

U.P. State of Road Transport Corporation through
Regional Manager, Dehradun, Distt. Dehradun
……Petitioner.

Versus

1. Labour Court, U.P. Dehradun, Distt. Dehradun
2. Birendra Bhandari, Authorized Representation UPSRTC Workers Union Local Bus Stand, Dehradun
……..Respondents

Shri A.N. Sharma, ld. counsel for the petitioner.
Shri M.C. Pant learned counsel for Respondents No. 2

Dated: 28.09.2005

Hon'ble P.C. Verma, J.

By means of this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for writ of Certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 10.09.2001, passed by Respondent No. 1-Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Dehradun in Misc. Case No. 275 of 2001.

Brief facts of the case according to the petitioner are that a claim application was filed by Respondent No. 2 under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for payment of arrears of different of salary, leave encashment and arrears of Dearness Allowance arose out of implementation of the recommendations of Vth pay commission. The leaned Tribunal after considering the entire evidence on record allowed the application of the Respondents No. 2 and ordered the petitioner to pay the amount which has been mentioned in the list against their names alongwith the cost of Rs. 200/- as litigation expenses to each employee under Section 33-C(2) of the Act. Feeling aggrieved, this writ petition has been field.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the entire evidence on record.

Before the learned Labour Court, the petitioner has accepted that recommendation of Vth pay commission is binding on the Corporation and according to the recommendation, the dues are payable to their employees. It was also accepted that the financial condition of the corporation is not good at present and as and when the financial condition will be improved, the dues shall be paid to the employees. Keeping in view the week financial condition of the Corporation, the Tribunal has rightly ordered to pay the dues to the employee- workmen within one month.

I do not find any force in the writ petition. The Labour Court has recorded the finding of fact, which does not call any interference.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(P.C. Verma, J.)

Rajeev Dang